We visit briefly in this chapter the ideas of Saul Mendlovitz and Samuel Kim, two important Western theorists of WOMP. While they shared with their other colleagues the common commitment to the values of peace, economic well being, social justice and ecological balance, they were particularly concerned that these values did not remain abstract and generalised statement of ideals. Applying as much to the means as to ends,\(^1\) these values were expected to shape also the politics of transition. It was for this reason that the two theorists favoured “operational definitions of values” which provided “insight into the social costs and benefits” and thereby made it possible “to assess trade-offs between values and to tell whether there has been any progress in a given period of international history with respect to the realization of world order values.”\(^2\) They stated: “Our search here, then, is for a more detached or objective appreciation of values as goals”.\(^3\)

Mendlovitz deservedly occupied a special place in the evolution of WOMP. He was not only the founder director of the project but also the main inspiration behind its becoming globally representative. Though himself a Western scholar, he worked hard to bring in non-western scholars and their perspectives. Mendlovitz was also interested in providing a more realistic and practical approach to the search for a just world order. He firmly believed that human intervention could move the world in a desired direction only when the nature of major challenges and problems was adequately understood. The most significant problems of international relations included arms race, risks of general war, transnational terrorism, economic stagnation, scarcity of natural resources, environmental pollution, and in the case of Third World countries, the consolidation of state.
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His writings were often marked by bold optimism and self-assurance. He believed that the world was integrating materially, ecologically as well as spiritually, and a global society was emerging. A global identity would overcome the differences which presently divide the world. Writing in 1975, for example, he could declare with aplomb that there was “no longer a question of whether or not there will be world government by the year 2000”. The questions, really are: “how it will come into being - by cataclysm, drift, more or less rational design”.

Samuel S. Kim emphasised a cross-cultural, trans-national search for a just and humane world order. At the heart of his approach was the belief that the politics of centralism and conventional agendas of governance and global reform would not work. Substantial restructuring is needed to be carried out at state and sub-state levels.

Kim was equally critical of Realism, Neo-Realism and Marxism - the dominant approaches in the study of international relations and sought to provide an alternative dimension to world order studies. Kim believed that the world was constituted of contradictory, contending and counter-pulling forces. “The challenging task of world order studies,” he said, was “to become familiar with the contradictory forces of creativity and destruction that affect the struggle for human emancipation”. The quest for a just world order “necessarily centres upon the mastery of these contending forces”. A dialectical framework of challenge and response must therefore become the basis of macro-level structural studies of the world system. This approach involves “(1) a diagnostic/prognostic task of describing present world order conditions and trends, (2) a modeling task of designing preferred futures, (3) a
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prescriptive task of mapping a transition process, including concrete steps and an overall strategy.\textsuperscript{10}

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section, which deals with Mendlovitz's ideas on peace and socio-political justice, is rather brief. This is so for two reasons: one, we find that his views on these two values closely resembled those of Richard Falk, which have been already discussed in a previous chapter; two, Mendlovitz did not pay any notable attention to the two other values of economic well-being and ecological balance. The second section takes up Kim's discussion of war and peace. The third section deals with Kim's analysis of economic well-being while the fourth section deals with his views on socio-political justice, ecological balance and the question of transition to a Preferred World.

Though Mendlovitz gave due regard to other values of WOMP, he believed that peace must be accorded primacy in theory and priority in practice. His writings until 1982 focused almost exclusively on the value of peace. At least initially, his definition of peace was rather restricted. He considered it almost synonymous with prevention of war. His approach to peace could be characterised as legal-institutional. His conviction was that war could be prevented with the help of appropriately enacted international laws.

Mendlovitz held that international law provided a realistic general framework. He was not deterred by the common criticism that solutions suggested from a legal-institutional perspective were too idealistic and utopian to be put into practice. As he pointed out:

one should not minimize the fact that the experience of living under law is almost universal and that law can be

appealed to in all societies as a rational method for achieving order and even justice in human affairs.\textsuperscript{11}

Turning around the position taken by the critics, he added,
Aside from a very few philosophical anarchists, most reasonable people - and this would include, for example, even revolutionaries and victims of oppression - envision a world in which law is properly used to control violence, resolve conflicts, redress harms, and promote social justice. In short, law as a method and goal for a world peace movement makes sense to the people of the world and to their governments.\textsuperscript{12}

In order to make implementation of international law effective, it was imperative that a transnational police force was created and assigned the task. Such a police force would work as an integral part of international organisation. Such an arrangement would have dual advantage: more directly, “the goal is to increase the governing ability of global organizations”;\textsuperscript{13} at a deeper level, it would also help in transforming the very nature of politics. The sharp demarcation presently maintained between national and international politics is based on strictly defined principles of sovereignty, nationalism and territoriality. The division not only generates conflicts which could have been eminently avoided, it also makes their resolution difficult by robbing international law of the authority so easily granted to municipal law. The transnational police could help in reversing the logic of such injurious distinctions. By operating at levels which are at once national and


\textsuperscript{12} ibid.

transnational, the police “domesticates international politics and transnationalizes national politics”.14

Mendlovitz also suggested that a course on war prevention should be taught in social science departments in colleges and universities.15 Such courses would create the intellectual environment conducive to world peace.

In his later writings, Mendlovitz seemed to be intertwining the values of peace and social justice when he started upholding the ideal of ‘just world peace.’ At the same time, he began to identify social movements as the most important source of global transformation. Social movements “raise crucial question about the nature of political life in a world of rapid change, both in terms of where political action ought to take place and in what form it ought to occur.”16

The emergence of social movements was itself not new. They could be traced back to the period around 1860s. Responsible for their emergence were the three major historical processes, which took place since the “age of discovery.”17 “The ideological revolution of egalitarianism, the technological and scientific revolution and the closely allied industrial cybernetic revolution”18 had led to the evolution of a global community. They had also converged problems like war, poverty, social injustice, ecological instability, identity crisis and alienation, etc. into global issues. At the same time, the gradual failure of the UN and its related agencies in finding solutions to these problems had convinced the concerned activists across the world that traditional international institutions could not provide appropriate or adequate
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fora. What was needed instead was direct involvement in what could be called global politics.\footnote{Saul H. Mendlovitz, "Introduction" in Saul H. Mendlovitz, ed., \textit{On the Creation of a Just World Order}, op cit., pp. xvi-xvii.}

The difference, therefore, was that whereas the older movements\footnote{R. B. J. Walker and Saul H. Mendlovitz, "Peace, Politics and Contemporary Social Movements" in Saul H. Mendlovitz and R. B. J. Walker, eds., \textit{Towards a Just World Peace: Perspectives from Social Movements}, op cit., p.9.} were "concerned primarily with changing the relationship between employers and workers" or "with the assertion of identity between competing ethno-national groups", the more contemporary movements had developed broader perspective and scope. They were promoting causes such as peace, human rights, environment, rights of indigenous peoples and alternate forms of economic life. Mendlovitz was not entirely happy, however, with the anti-statist stance often taken by them. The basic challenge before these social movements, he thought, was "to generate creative connections with other progressive actors, whether they be people working within state structures, international organizations, or even states themselves".\footnote{ibid., p.10.}

II

Quite like Mendlovitz, Samuel S. Kim too conceptualized peace essentially in terms of prevention of war. Pointing to the "pervasiveness of war through time and across space", Kim\footnote{Richard Falk, and Samuel S. Kim, "General Introduction" in Richard Falk, and Samuel S. Kim, eds., \textit{The War System: An Interdisciplinary Approach}, Boulder, Westview Press, 1980, p. 1.} argued that it continued to act "as the main motivating force of change in relations among sovereign states." He lamented the fact that "There are no effective mechanisms of peaceful change in international society".\footnote{ibid.}

Kim observed that there had been three distinct stages in the study of war, each with a different approach: the mono-disciplinary approach of traditional international relations, the interdisciplinary approach of peace
research, and the transdisciplinary approach of world order studies”. Discussing the conceptual and methodological assumptions and value preferences of these approaches, Kim rejected as inadequate all variants found in the traditional international relations theory, be it the ‘pessimistic inevitability school’, the ‘utopian blueprint school’, or the ‘mono-causal school’. Kim agreed with Falk that war had to be understood as a ‘social system.’ Defining the ‘war system’, they argued that it was "an all embracing structure of mutually interlocking organizational and behavioural variables, in which violence or force is accepted and legitimized as the ultimate arbiter of social conflicts at all levels of human society." Therefore, in order to move decisively from the war system to a peace system, war should be understood in all its dimensions “it is not easy to disentangle “war” from its economic, social, psychological, cultural and normative complex of interactions that has shaped human struggle over the course of centuries.”

While trying to establish the causes of war, Kim and Falk emphasised the need for an “inter-disciplinary etiological approach, drawing upon insights and findings of relevant disciplines involved in the study of human behaviour in general and human conflict behaviour in particular”. Kim borrowed concepts from different disciplines like law, philosophy, ethics, and theology. Along with Falk, he found definite relationship between war and knowledge, war and ideology, war and survival, war and history, war and security, and lastly, war and world order.

Kim pointed out that the concept of security had been nationalized, militarized and globalized ever since the end of Second World War. The concept of ‘international regimes’ could be gainfully employed for assessing
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these trends. He divided ‘international security regimes’ into three categories: the international arms trade regime; the international arms control regime; and the international disarmament regime.\textsuperscript{30} The working of these regimes revealed the structural problems of the existing international hierarchy. As long as the militarized conception of security and the present structure of global dominance did not change, the arms race would also persist.\textsuperscript{31}

Besides war, Kim was equally concerned about other forms of violence. He defined violence as “a pathological force that destroys or diminishes life sustaining and life-enhancing processes”.\textsuperscript{32} Violence needed to be minimized “in both a narrow (direct/physical) and broad (indirect/structural) sense”.\textsuperscript{33}

Kim believed that international law had to play a crucial role in reducing the frequency and intensity of war and violence. It could help in peaceful resolution of differences before they escalated into violent conflicts and wars. At a deeper level, international law could promote world order values. This is so because “Law making is a value shaping and value realizing process. A world order approach requires a teleological appraisal of the role of contemporary international law and law-making in terms of widely affirmed human aspirations and needs for peace, economic well being, social justice and environmental protection.”\textsuperscript{34}

In this context, Kim analysed the changing perceptions of international law, as a result of which classical notions of international law were giving way. Kim argued,

The nature of international law, or at least the general perception of it, has changed considerably since the Peace of Westphalia. As the normative foundation of the Westphalian international order(1648-1945),
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classical international law has long been perceived as a juridical expression of the ideological cultural hegemony of the politically dominant Western societies during the heyday of colonial expansionism. The Third World was able to challenge it only collectively, as a global actor in the U.N. law making process. The resulting 'new' or 'contemporary' international law, spawned by the UN’s legislative process, has gradually come to be directed for the protection of the weak against the interventionary pressures of the strong.\textsuperscript{35}

While this was a definite sign of progress, much more was needed to be done. Kim added that

The basic challenge ahead is to seek a better interface between UN lawmaking and the voices of the unheard and unrepresented by opening up more and more channels of communication and contact with the non-state social actors and forces struggling at periphery of the present world order system.\textsuperscript{36}

III

Kim pointed out that global inequities, which continued to persist everywhere, had two dimensions - human and national. The human dimension consisted of the fact that poor of the world did not have access to basic human needs such as food, shelter, safe drinking water, primary healthcare, literacy and remunerative employment. Hunger persisted not because global stocks of food were inadequate but because global distribution of income was such that the poor had no purchasing capacity. The population explosion in the poorest developing countries too may be traced back to poverty, illiteracy, and lack of primary healthcare leading to high
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mortality rates. Lack of safe drinking water led to widespread waterborne
diseases—diarrhoea, malaria and schistosomiasis.37 The national dimension
of global inequities was reflected in the patterns of over-development-
underdevelopment, dominance-dependence, and center-periphery relations
among states, perpetuated by the post-war economic order established under
Bretton Woods arrangements. The demand for a ‘New International Economic
Order’ (NIEO) made in the 1970s addressed this dimension of global inequities
and sought equitable access to capital, markets, resources, and technology.38
The demand did not succeed because the capitalist world economy had
sufficient payoffs and penalties at its command to divide the poor nations.
Moreover, there exists a “capitalist global knowledge industry” which sells
“modernization” theory “as the only path to the promised land”.39

Kim examined the defining characteristics of the two normative
principles of distributive justice arising from these dimensions of inequities:
the New International Economic Order (NIEO) principle and the Basic Human
Needs (BHN) principle. The elusive role of the state for human well being was
the central normative dilemma. Since the state continued to exist despite
ideological, geopolitical and developmental divisions, it was the only
organisation which would promote general economic well being and would
fulfil the Basic Human Needs (BHN). However, the state sometimes could
promote only urban centred class interests, and an instrument of status drive
in international politics.40

The two principles of distributive justice could not be realized unless
the poorest countries and the worst off groups participated in the decision
making process at national and global levels.41 He stressed the need to
reconcile the two and suggested possible ways of doing so in world order
studies.42
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On the question of social justice, Kim confined himself largely to the discussion of human rights. He pointed out: “Human rights are those claims and demands which are essential to the protection of human life and the enhancement of human dignity.” Human rights, according to Kim, have passed through three successive stages: “the first generation of civil and political rights; the second generation of social, economic and cultural rights; and the third generation of solidarity rights.”

The struggle for human rights was part of the age old struggle for human emancipation, which initially originated in the West in the wake of Enlightenment and had now spread all over the world. But human rights still remain a major issue even in developed countries. A normative inquiry into global human rights politics was therefore extremely important. Since, there are widespread human rights abuses, an interface between the human rights and world order agendas, according to Kim should be based on the following premises:

- Every human life, regardless of its location in social, territorial, and ethnic space, is of equal value and therefore entitled to equal protection;
- Each human life is an end itself and as such it cannot be devalued as a means to the right of others;
- Each human person or group is entitled to democratic participation in the shaping and reshaping of human rights values;
- Each human person is entitled to equal benefit in the sharing of human rights values;
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• Human rights are mutually interdependent and indivisible, but some rights are more basic and essential than others in human development;
• The affirmation of the supreme value of human life and dignity is the only way to reconcile the conflicts between cultural relativism and universal human rights norms.\textsuperscript{46}

The world order/human rights interface would, therefore, require active persuasion of the following tasks
• “clarifying of core assumptions and principles;
• redefining “human rights”;
• formulating the human rights/human needs nexus; and
• establish a world order hierarchy of human rights.”\textsuperscript{47}

Kim was influenced by the works of Barry Commoner,\textsuperscript{48} and Harold and Margaret Sprout\textsuperscript{49} on environmental issues. He used the notion of ‘Ecological Problematique’ to encompass “the whole indivisible complex of conceptual, psychological, normative, and structural processes and problems that set the parameters of system transformation”.\textsuperscript{50}

Kim argued that the ecological crisis was historically a product of the worldwide pursuance of what he called ‘Center model core industrial capitalism’.\textsuperscript{51} This form of capitalism produced exploitative and unjust social structures, and distorted domestic as well as international development. He believed that ecological stability and human well being were interrelated. A healthy model of economic development therefore had to take care also of ‘eco-development.’ According to him, “a just and humane eco-order should
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satisfy the following value requirements: socio-economic justice; basic human rights; humane governance; and ecological safety.\textsuperscript{52} This called for a transformation of both intra-national and international structures. It also called for changes in basic social values reflected in individual behaviour and lifestyles.\textsuperscript{53}

Kim divided the global environment into a complex set of distinct but closely intertwined and interacting subsystems. On the one hand, there was the natural environment, consisting of atmospheric, marine, and terrestrial environments. On the other hand, there was the social environment, constituted by such human activities as population growth, resource use and militarization.\textsuperscript{54}

In order to know the extent to which the present international system was capable of realising the world order value of ecological balance, Kim examined three types of activities: expansion of knowledge, shaping of values and implementation process. With regard to the knowledge-expansion process, Kim emphasized research, information exchange, and monitoring as these were delineated in the United Nations Environmental Programme. The value-shaping process was concerned essentially with the preparation and adoption of multilateral declarations, conventions and treaties. Kim undertook detailed discussion of the two U.N. conferences on Human Environment held at Stockholm in 1972 and at Nairobi in 1982. He brought out notable features of the Stockholm Declaration and examined its limitations. He reviewed the progress made in environmental law in the post-Stockholm period and the role of UNEP therein. He drew attention to the problems in UNEP’s implementation process and tried to redefine the implementation role of UNEP.\textsuperscript{55}
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Kim concluded:

Ultimately the quest for decent environment is but one part of the quest for a more just and humane world order. The quest to bring the social environment into harmony with the natural environment does not seem too promising without normative, structural and behavioural transformations in both domestic and international societies. The transformations envisaged in this alternative ecodevelopmental path depend on the extent to which non-state actors - dedicated private citizens, local and national groups, and transnational NGOs, all currently crying out for recognition at the edges of the power structure - can mobilize their renewable normative energies and political resources to form a broad-based, sustainable movement.56

Kim’s attitude is best described as “concerned optimism”, a combination of pessimism about the present human condition, but necessary self mobilising optimism about human capacity, the principle of indeterminacy as well as possibility of the continuity of the present amongst others. The preferred future world, required according to Kim, a transformation “from the domain of facts” to “the domain of values.”57

Kim thought of transition as “a series of normatively purposive and politically planned processes designed to change the course of human development; we mean the process of building relevant and reliable bridges and pathways to connect us to the preferred futures.”58

This involved “the designing of possible and preferred scenarios of alternative world futures” and laying down “broad orientational guides for the
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transition process." A constant balance would have to be maintained between the desirable normative goals and feasible transition strategies in the search for a relevant utopia. "How" and "Where" we look were the two determining factors for the prospect of a relevant utopia.\footnote{ibid., p. 302.}

He added that "The quest for a just world order is a collective, transnational struggle in which individuals and groups at different systemic levels join hands, actively participating in ongoing social, political, economic and cultural processes that embrace all of humanity."\footnote{ibid., p. 301.}